Filed 08/07/2007

Page 1 of 3

Case 3:07-mc-80123-MMC Document 50

I, Jennifer A. Kuenster, declare:

4

1

2

- 3
- 5 6
- 7 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

SF #1318629 v1

- I am a member of the State Bar of California and a partner of Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP ("Thelen"). Except for matters based on knowledge and belief, I have personal knowledge of the following facts, and if called to testify, could and would competently testify thereto.
- 2. On or about May 14, 2007, counsel for plaintiffs Angeles Chemical Company, et al. served a civil subpoena to produce documents on Thelen at its San Francisco. California office. Also on or about May 15, 2007, counsel for plaintiffs served virtually identical document subpoenas on, respectively, Thelen's offices in San Jose and Palo Alto, California. An amended document subpoena was served on Thelen's San Francisco office on or about June 4, 2007. True and correct copies of the document subpoenas are attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- Thelen served written objections to the Document Subpoenas on or about 3. May 29, 2007, and June 15, 2007. True and correct copies of the written objections to the subpoenas are attached hereto as Exhibit B.
- On or about June 20, 2007, counsel for plaintiffs sent a letter addressed to 4. Nevin Brownfield, a Thelen associate, proposing a telephone conference on June 22, 2007 to meet and confer about the document subpoenas and Thelen's objections. In response, Thelen proposed a conference call on June 25, 2007.
- 5. I am informed that on or about June 25, 2007, Thelen attorneys Ross Petty and Nevin Brownfield participated in a meet and confer conference call with counsel for plaintiffs, including Jeff Caufield and Joe Rossettie of Caufield & James, concerning the scope of the document subpoenas. Plaintiffs' counsel advised that they were seeking the production of any original McKesson Chemical operational records in Thelen's possession, or confirmation that Thelen did not currently possess any such records.
- 6. It is my understanding that a company known as Univar acquired certain McKesson Chemical Company assets from McKesson Corporation in approximately 1986, but that acquisition did not include the McKesson Chemical Company facility located at 9005 Sorenson Avenue, Santa Fe Springs, California (the "Santa Fe Springs site") at issue in the

1	Angeles Chemical Company, et al. v. McKesson Corporation
2	Thelen has been retained by Univar and McKesson in varior
ر.	and I am the partner responsible for Univar and McKesson r
4	knowledge, the matters handled by Thelen are completely in
5	the Angeles Chemical Company, et al. v. McKesson Corpore
6	7. In connection with Thelen's represent
7	various personal injury matters, in about April 2003, Thelen
8	McKesson Chemical Company records from Univar. After
9	boxes, all of the boxes were placed in storage at Thelen's of
10	Francisco, California.
11	8. The McKesson Chemical Company re
12	remained in Thelen's possession continuously until January
13	from Univar's outside counsel. Leslie Schenck of the law fin
14	Seattle, Washington, that Thelen forward all of the original
15	records stored at Thelen's offices. Under my direction, all c
16	Chemical Company records were shipped to Ms. Schenck in
17	other original McKesson Chemical Company records that w
18	a further search of Thelen's files following the receipt of the
10	my knowledge Thelen no longer has possession of any origi
20	records in any of its offices.
21	I declare under penalty of perjury under the l
22	foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge ar
23	August, 2007 at Houston, Texas.
24	
25	A. A.
26	
27	·
20	

Angeles Chemical Company, et al. v. McKesson Corporation, et al. litigation. More recently,
Thelen has been retained by Univar and McKesson in various personal injury litigation matters,
and I am the partner responsible for Univar and McKesson representation at this firm. To my
cnowledge, the matters handled by Thelen are completely unrelated to the Santa Fe Springs site or
he Angeles Chemical Company, et al. v. McKesson Corporation, et al. litigation.
7. In connection with Thelen's representation of Univar and McKesson in
various personal injury matters, in about April 2003. Thelen received various boxes of original
McKesson Chemical Company records from Univar. After Thelen completed its review of the
poxes, all of the boxes were placed in storage at Thelen's offices at 101 Second Street, San
Francisco, California.
8. The McKesson Chemical Company records that Thelen received in 2003
remained in Thelen's possession continuously until January 2006, when Thelen received a request
from Univar's outside counsel. Leslie Schenek of the law firm of Garvey Schubert Barer in
Seattle, Washington, that Thelen forward all of the original McKesson Chemical Company
records stored at Thelen's offices. Under my direction, all of the boxes of original McKesson
Chemical Company records were shipped to Ms. Schenek in January 2006. I am not aware of any
other original McKesson Chemical Company records that were ever sent to Thelen, and, based on
a further search of Thelen's files following the receipt of the document subpoenas in this action, to
my knowledge Thelen no longer has possession of any original McKesson Chemical Company
records in any of its offices.
I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and helief. Executed this \mathcal{T}^{μ} day of
August, 2007 at Houston, Texas.
Jennifer A. Kuenster